IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.V.K.BALI

WEDNESDAY, THE 6TH DECEMBER 2006 / 15TH AGRAHAYANA 1928

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 488 of 1999()

CRA.215/1996 of SESSIONS COURT, THRISSUR
CC.194/1994 of JUDL. MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS COURT, VADAKKANCHERY

.....

REVN. PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

CHANDRASEKHARAN, S/O.VELAYUDHAN,
KOTHOTTUVEETTIL, PARAPPANANGADI,
CHIRAMANGALAM VILLAGE, NETTUVA DESOM,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.P.VIJAYA BHANU
SRI.S.R.MANOJ

RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT:

STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF
KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR MR.P.RAVINDRA BABU
SMT.DAISY THAMPI (FOR DEFACTO COMPLAINANT)

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 06/12/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V.K. BALI, C.J.

Crl.R.P.No.488 of 1999 &
Crl.M.Appln Nos.12177 & 12178 of 2006

Dated, this the 6th day of December, 2006

ORDER

V.K.Bali,C.J.(Oral)

Petitioner has been held guilty for offences under Sections 332 and 353 of the Indian Penal Code and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one year under Section 332 IPC. However, no separate sentence was awarded for the offence under Section 353 IPC, vide order dated 30th July, 1996 passed by the Judicial Magistrate of the First Class, Wadakkancherry. In the appeal preferred against the order aforesaid the learned Sessions Judge, Thrissur vide order dated 9th June, 1999 modified the judgment and reduced the sentence to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of one month and to pay a fine of Rs.5000/- and in default of payment of fine to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a further period of three months. It is against these orders that the present revision has been filed.

2. During the pendency of this revision, Crl.M.Appln. Nos.12177 and 12178 of 2006 have been filed by the counsel for

the petitioner and counsel for the defacto complainant respectively to record the compromise and quash the conviction and sentence imposed on the revision petitioner by the courts below and to acquit him. It has, inter alia, been pleaded in the applications aforesaid that the disputes between the revision petitioner and the defacto complainant have been compromised and amicably settled.

In view of the compromise arrived at between the parties, the impugned orders are set aside and the Criminal Revision Petition is allowed. Crl.M.Appln. Nos.12177 and 12178 of 2006 shall stand recorded.

V.K. BALI,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

vns